



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,329	08/01/2003	Paul V. Goode JR.	DEXCOM.026A	4198
20995	7590	10/05/2006	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			NASSER, ROBERT L	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3735	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/633,329	GOODE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Robert L. Nasser	3735	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant should note that the large number of references in the attached IDS have been considered by the examiner in the same manner as other documents in Office search files are considered by the examiner while conducting a search of the prior art in a proper field of search. See MPEP 609.05(b). Applicant is requested to point out any particular references in the IDS which they believe may be of particular relevance to the instant claimed invention in response to this office action.

Claims 11, 17, 36, 49, 58 and 60 are objected to. Claims 11 and 58 and claims 49 and 60 are objected to for being substantial duplicates of each other. In addition, claims 17 and 36 recite alerting a dependent. It is unclear what a dependent is.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4-7, 11, 15-20, 23-26, 30, 34-040, 43-45, and 49-62 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Mastrototaro article entitled "The Minimed Continuous Glucose Monitoring System," which was cited by applicant. Mastrototaro teaches a method of calibrating a subcutaneously implanted glucose sensor by taking two or more readings from a reference sensor and one or more readings from the implanted sensor, matching the readings to each other calculating a calibration or conversion function (i.e. calibration factors), and then adjusting future readings based

Art Unit: 3735

on the factors. It also evaluates the quality of calibration by requiring that the mean absolute difference between below a threshold. In addition, if the quality is not sufficient, the method notifies the user by providing an indication or alarm on the monitor. The Mastrototaro article also has a system and a computer system for performing the method.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 8-10, 21, 22, 27-29, 21, 41, 42, and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mastrototaro. Claims 2, 3, 21, 22, 41, and 42 are rejected in that the examiner takes official notice that it is well known to smooth data, to eliminate the effects of anomalous data. As such, it would have been obvious to modify Mastrototaro to smooth the data, to improve the accuracy of measurements. Claims 8-10, 27-29, and 46-48 are rejected in that Mastrototaro does not teach how the reference device communicates to the system. The examiner takes official notice that wired and wireless connections are well known and that it would have been obvious to have the receiver integral with the system.

Claims 12-14, 31-33, and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mastrototaro in view of Sato et al 20030023171. Mastrototaro teaches that calibration is of sufficient quality when the correlation coefficient is .79 or greater. It does not teach how to measure the coefficient. Sato et al teaches in

paragraph [0094] that least squares regression is a known method to calculate the correlation coefficient. As such, it would have been obvious to modify Mastrototaro to use a least squares regression to determine the correlation coefficient, as it is merely the substitution of one known determining method for another.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Shin et al shows a similar calibration method.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert L. Nasser whose telephone number is 571 272-4731. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor II can be reached on 571 272-4730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3735

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert L. Nasser  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3735

RLN



ROBERT L. NASSER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER